

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, 15-21, 25-28, 30, 32 and 35 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 11, 12, 15, 18, 20, 25, 32 and 35 have been currently amended while claims 7, 14, 22-24, and 29 have been canceled as shown on pages 2-7 of the Reply. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification as filed at Figs. 6-8 and related description at page 19 line 21 – page 21 line 5. Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the teleconference of January 14, 2008. The amendments to the subject claims in view of the cited art were discussed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 8, 10, 12, 14, 20, 25-26, 32 and 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 8, 10, 12, 14, 20, 25-26, 32 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips, *et al.* (US 6,721,555) in view of Rekimoto, *et al.* (US 2005/0120096). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of at least the following. The cited documents alone or in combination do not teach or suggest all aspects recited in the subject claims.

The claimed subject matter generally relates to a physical device bonding system employing the use of a token key to facilitate the installation of a plurality of wireless devices to a network entity to establish a non-physical connection by the invocation component employing installation and/or authentication protocols. To this end, independent claims 1, 12, 20, 25, 32 and 35 recite similar features namely: *a token key comprised within the physical interface component that physically connects a plurality of devices simultaneously, stores the at least one of an installation or authentication protocols for later use and establishes respective non-physical connections of the plurality of devices to at least one network entity.* None of the cited documents alone or in combination teach nor suggest such claimed aspects.

Phillips, *et al.* relates to systems and methods for handling and supporting authentication protocols in a wireless communications network. Accordingly, a wireless

phone (Mobile Terminal (MT2)) and accompanying electronic devices (Terminal Equipment (TE2)) are coupled through an interface between the wireless phone transceiver (Mobile Station Modem (MSM)) and an accompanying TE2 device called the R.sub.m interface. Contrary to the assertion on page 3 of the subject Final Office Action, nowhere does Phillips, *et al.* teach or suggest that R.sub.m interface physically connects to the terminal equipment and later to the mobile terminal and is disconnected in order that they communicate wirelessly. In fact, from the detailed specification of Phillips, *et al.* it is clear that R.sub.m interface needs to be continuously connected in order to facilitate communication between the Mobile Terminal (MT2) and the accompanying electronic devices (Terminal Equipment (TE2)). (*See* Phillips, *et al.* col.1 lines 30-45, col.8 lines 38-40).

The secondary document Rekimoto, *et al.* relates to a portable information terminal placed in proximity with an ID recognition unit of a notebook PC thereby exchanging ID, network address and suitable operation information. Accordingly, by using one device connected to the other device by a wired or wireless network the operation of the device can be controlled (*See* Rekimoto, *et al.* Abstract). However, Rekimoto, *et al.* teaches exchange of ID data when the notebook PC and the portable terminal are connected via the human body. It does not however teach a physical interface component that stores authentication/installation protocols of a plurality of devices when they are physically connected and later used for establishing wireless communications between the devices and at least one network entity when the entity is later connected to the physical interface component. Rather Rekimoto, *et al.* relates to simultaneously connecting the portable terminal and the notebook PC and does not teach or suggest storing installation/authentication protocols within the physical interface component for later use as recited in the subject independent claims.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is clear that the cited documents alone or in combination do not teach or suggest all aspects recited in the subject claims. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is requested with respect to independent claims 1, 12, 20, 25, 32, 35 and all claims that respectively depend there from.

II. Rejection of Claims 6, 9, 15-19, 21, 27 and 30 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6, 9, 15-19, 21, 27 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips, *et al.* in view of Rekimoto, *et al.* in view of Plisson, *et al.* (US 6,795,688). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 6, 9, 15-19, 21, 27 and 30 depend from independent claims 1, 12, 20, 25, 35 and as stated *supra*, Phillips, *et al.* in view of Rekimoto, *et al.* does not teach or suggest all aspects recited in these independent claims. Plisson, *et al.* relates to dynamically configuring a device adapted to be communicatively coupled in a wireless network with an attribute corresponding to a characteristic of the device. However, Plisson, *et al.* fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiency of Phillips, *et al.* with respect to the subject independent claims. Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is requested with respect to dependent claims 6, 9, 15-19, 21, 27 and 30.

III. Rejection of Claims 7, 11, 22 and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7, 11, 22 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips, *et al.* in view of Rekimoto, *et al.* and further in view of Silvester (U.S. 20030172271). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 7, 22 and 29 have been canceled and their limitations have been included in their respective base claims 1, 20, 25 and as stated *supra*, Phillips, *et al.* in view of Rekimoto, *et al.* does not teach or suggest all aspects recited in these independent claims. In anticipation of an obviousness rejection of the subject independent claims, the following arguments are provided on how the independent claims differentiate over a combination of Phillips, *et al.* in view of Rekimoto, *et al.* and Silvester.

Silvester relates to wireless device set-up and authentication using voice stream identification information. However, Silvester fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiency of Phillips, *et al.* and Rekimoto, *et al.* with respect to the subject independent claims. In particular, it does not teach a physical interface component comprising a token key that simultaneously connects physically to a plurality of devices and reserves installation and/or authentication protocols for later use as recited in the subject independent claims. On page 8 of the subject Final Office Action it is erroneously

contended that Silvester teaches a token key that stores authentication/installation protocols. Rather, Silvester relates to a method of detecting wireless devices in an area surrounding a host device wherein the host device initially polls the area for audio source devices. Once detected the host device initiates an authentication handshake with an audio source device wherein an unshared authentication key will invoke audio device initialization procedures. These procedures facilitate exchange of authentication keys between devices. However, nowhere does Silvester disclose that the audio devices are physically connected to an interface which stores authentication/installation protocols which is then later disconnected and re-connected to the host device for establishing wireless communications between the audio devices and the host device. Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 13 and 28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 13 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips, *et al.* in view of Rekimoto, *et al.* in view of Chaskar, *et al.* (U.S. 20050066044). Claims 13 and 28 depend from independent claims 1 and 25 respectively and as stated *supra*, Phillips, *et al.* in view of Rekimoto, *et al.* does not teach or suggest all aspects recited in these independent claims. Chaskar, *et al.* relates to an IP based system that employs a GPS component in connection with a position determining entity (PDE) to determine location of a target mobile station via the Internet. However, Chaskar, *et al.* fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiency of Phillips, *et al.* with respect to the subject independent claims. Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is requested with respect to dependent claims 13 and 28.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TURCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TURCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731